UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,587	02/06/2004	Masahiro Takahashi	0553-0397	6735
	7590 07/10/200 <b>McFARRON, MANZ</b>	EXAMINER		
	MEHLER, LTD.	ROY, SIKHA		
SUITE 2850	AMIS STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL	60606	2879		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/773,587	TAKAHASHI, MASAHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sikha Roy	2879	

	Sikha Roy	2879					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 19 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
<ul> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>							
<ul> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [</li> </ul>	·	•	-				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed: 1,4,9,14,20,23,28,30,33,34,36 and 39.  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 5,8,15,19,24 and 27.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	ided below or appended.	i be entered and an e.	кріанаціон оі				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  13. Other:							
	/Sikha Roy/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2879					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments in response to rejection of claims 5, 15 and 24 are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's allegation that Shimizu does not disclose the claimed feature of transparent film comprising silicon oxynitride formed over the second electrode the Examiner respectfully submits that Shimizu teaches that including the refractive index varying transparent film such that the refractive index can be approximated to the those of the layers at the bottom and at the top, difference in refractive index can be minimized and hence the reflection at the interfaces can be minimized. Therefore it would have been obvious to include the transparent film of varying refractive index formed over the second electrode (r.i. 1.9) and between the second electrode and the resin (refractive index about 1.49) filling the gap of display with light emitting from the second electrode side of Yamazaki('431), the refractive index of the transparent film decreasing from (1.9 to 1.5) the first interface (at the side of the second electrode) to the second interface (at the side of resin) as taught by Shimizu for minimizing reflection at interfaces between the layers and efficiently light emission with high luminance. Toyoshima is combined for teaching of the transparent film with varying refractive index comprising silicon oxynitride. So it would be obvious to one of ordianry skill in the art to substitute the transparent film with varying refractive index of Shimizu by the silicon oxynitride film of Toyoshima for providing the minimization of reduction in reflection at the interfaces.

## **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sikha Roy/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879